

South African opposition to Jewish immigrants in the 1930s // South African communism pushed by Jews

Moderator: [Moderator](#)

Forum rules

Be sure to read the [Rules/guidelines](#) before you post!

Post Reply



Search this topic...



4 posts • Page 1 of 1



Lamprecht
Valuable asset




South African opposition to Jewish immigrants in the 1930s // South African communism pushed by Jews

1 year 4 months ago (Wed Apr 22, 2020 8:23 am)

There was a time when White people in their own countries were demanding the complete prohibition of Jewish immigration. I touched on this [in a post on the United States](#) but here we shall speak of South Africa.

South Africa, in regards to European exploration, was first discovered by the Portuguese and later colonized by the Dutch. After the end of the Napoleonic wars in the 1810s, South Africa was ceded to the British who began settling it that same decade. But by 1931, South Africa was fully sovereign from the United Kingdom with the passage of the Statute of Westminster, which abolished the last powers of the British Government on the country.

During Hitler's pre-WWII leadership of Germany (1933 to September 1939 - when WWII broke out) he had taken away the citizenship of Jews and replaced them with ethnic Germans. German universities, schools, newspapers, films, legal and medical professions were being [peacefully] cleansed of Jews and communist subversives. Between 1933 and 1939, two-thirds of German Jews had already emigrated from the country. Many of these emigrating Jews attempted to enter South Africa, where Jewish domination of the diamond and alcohol industries (among others) already existed. These Jews living in South Africa were amassing huge fortunes, while the White gentiles were getting poorer.

The situation of South Africa in WWII was complex. In 1934, the South African Party and National Party merged to form the United Party, seeking reconciliation between Afrikaners (mainly Dutch settlers) and English-speaking Whites. In 1939, the party split over the entry of the Union into World War II as an ally of the United Kingdom, a move that the National Party followers strongly opposed. [You can read about this on Wikipedia](#)  or other sources for more details.

I will post a speech from 1939 by South African legislator and diplomat Eric Hendrik Louw, introducing a bill into the South African House of Deputies in early 1939 calling for the prohibition of all future Jewish immigration into that country. This was after the "[Aliens Act 1 of 1937](#)" and was the 26th act of South Africa's Parliament in 1939, called the "Aliens Registration Act"

It was not an end to all immigration or quota restrictions like in the USA's 1924 act, it was an explicitly "No more Jews" bill. His following words appeared in Debates of the House of Assembly (Hansard), 2nd Session, 8th Parliament, Volume 33 (Feb. 3 – Mar. 31, 1939).

The source of his statements are found in an article in Instauration magazine, November 1978:

[http://web.archive.org/web/201010112142 ... vember.pdf](http://web.archive.org/web/201010112142...vember.pdf)

“ Since this Bill was published it has been very severely criticized in the Press. It has been described as contemptible, as intolerant, as uncouth, and what not. I myself have been labeled as a racist, as un-Christian, as a political opportunist, and as a South African prototype of Herr Streicher. Coming from certain sections of the Press, I do not think that the criticisms need be taken too seriously either as reflecting the considered opinion of these particular newspapers or as reflecting the opinion of the majority of their readers...

What we have heard has been nothing but “His Master’s Voice,” that voice which does not hesitate to command or to threaten when Jewish interests are involved...We have been witnessing the same sort of thing in international affairs during the past few years, and particularly during the month of September of last year in regard to the news reports which have been coming to South Africa from most of Europe. Those news reports I am convinced were then, and to-day still are, to a large extent inspired by Jewish influence. Those reports were, and are intended to stir up public feeling in regard to Germany. The efforts of Mr. Chamberlain and of M. Daladier towards appeasement have been rendered infinitely more difficult by the overt and hidden campaign which has been carried on under the influence of Jewish pressure, by the news agencies and by the Press.

In September of last year a very considerable section of world Jewry was literally praying for England to be involved in a war with Germany. They were bitterly disappointed when Mr. Chamberlain and M. Daladier were able to come to an agreement with Herr Hitler at Munich and they have not yet forgiven Mr. Chamberlain and M. Daladier. I am convinced that if it were possible to remove Jewish influence and Jewish pressure from the Press, and from the news agencies, the international outlook would be considerably brighter than it is to-day. In introducing this Bill I am actuated neither by Fascism nor racialism. I have acted solely as a South African, as a member, sir, of one of the two sections of our population in South Africa whose forefathers were the pioneers of this country, who built up South Africa and made it what it is to-day. I am a member of one of those two sections that are going to remain in South Africa. There is amongst either the English or the Dutch-speaking South Africans nothing which is comparable to the Zionist movement of the Jews.

In introducing this Bill I have acted as a South African who is genuinely worried about the creation of a new and additional race problem in South Africa. In the second place I, and those who feel with me, are worried about the extent to which a race, alien to, and unassimilable with the English and Dutch-speaking population in South Africa, has during past years been securing control of business and industry, and also of the professions. I know that in this matter my feelings are shared by tens of thousands of South Africans, English as well as Afrikaans-speaking...The main principle of this Bill is that it admits the existence in South Africa of a Jewish problem, and it faces up to that problem...I say that if it is not faced, and if it is not tackled, we are going to have in South Africa a repetition of the history that has taken place in the countries of Europe...Now, Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps appropriate that this matter of Communism should be dealt with in a Bill which also deals with the Jewish question, because Communism, since its earliest days has been linked with Jewry.

This has been denied by the Jews but such denial is not in accordance with the facts. I do not

suggest that all Jews are Communists. But I do say that the Jews were the people who conceived the idea of Communism, and it was by the Jews that Communism was directed, and is still being directed to-day. That is perfectly comprehensible because Communism is international, and a Jew is international in his outlook. Communism had its birth in the teachings of Karl Marx, who was a Jew. If we study the history of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, we find that the great majority of those who were the instigators of the revolution, and who occupied the most prominent posts in the Bolshevik Government were Jews.. I can also speak from my personal observations during the course of my diplomatic service in the Union, when I had the opportunity of seeing who were the representatives of this Soviet Government. I found that in most cases they were of the Jewish race.

I remember the Soviet delegation to the league of Nations. In that delegation there were seven Jews and one Russian. We find that in most countries where Communism has taken root the leaders of Communism are Jews. That is also the case in South Africa. The two leaders of Communism in South Africa are Messrs. Solly Sachs and Weinberg...[It is] clearly established that it was the intention of the Communist Party to establish in South Africa a Black republic...

Now I come to what is the main feature of the Bill, namely the new principle introduced of definitely naming the Jewish race as a race not suitable for immigration into South Africa. This is the feature of the Bill that has been most discussed, most criticised, and I am glad to say most commended... [In] the 1930 Quota Act...the Jew was aimed at, but not specifically named. In this Act he is specifically named. Now the objection which is made is that in this Act I discriminate against the Jew as such. I frankly admit that there is discrimination against the Jew as an immigrant, and against the Jew who is still an alien in South Africa. And while on this question of discrimination, let me point out this to those newspapers, and to those who have been the most violent critics of my Bill, that they themselves practise a form of discrimination against the Jew — not the man who is coming in, not the Jew who is an alien, but the old-established Jew.

These very people are practising a form of discrimination which, in my opinion, hurts the Jew in his self-respect and pride far more than anything in the Bill. I refer to social discrimination. That is being practised every day. The same man who writes the editorial criticising my Bill: the same man who gets on a platform and makes a speech in defence of the Jew. Those same men will not propose a Jew as a member of their exclusive clubs! ... These same people who call me intolerant, and accuse me of discrimination, speak contemptuously of the Jews as "Yids" when they are in private conversation among themselves, or having a drink together. I have been accused of anti-Semitism, and what not, but let me say in all sincerity that I have never yet in private conversation spoken of a Jew as a "Yid." These people who pose as friends of the Jews are the same people who are practising social discrimination against the Jews in South Africa.

And it is not only in South Africa, it is the same in America...I say that such an attitude on the part of those who are to-day accusing me of anti-Semitism, of racialism and intolerance, is nothing but rank hypocrisy. Furthermore, it is not fair to the Jews themselves. It places the Jew in a false position; it gives him a false sense of security, and afterwards when he wakes up and finds that there is a certain amount of anti-Jewish feeling in the country, then he is surprised, because to his face he has been told one thing, and behind his back another attitude is adopted. Such hypocrisy complicates an already serious problem. My Bill certainly does not suffer from hypocrisy. It is characterised by complete candour and frankness. But unfortunately candour and frankness is very often mistaken for hostility.

Why is this principle of discrimination introduced into my Bill? Because in the first place the Jew is not assimilable...That the Jew is not assimilable has been shown from the records of history, and it is also admitted by the Jew himself. Secondly, this Bill discriminates against the Jewish immigrant and Jewish alien, because owing to certain racial characteristics he creates a problem in any country as soon as the Jewish population exceeds a certain percentage of the total. Thirdly, because in South Africa the Jewish population has already reached that percentage, and consequently we have with us to-day a Jewish problem which must be squarely faced.

I will deal first with assimilation, because that is the basic principle of my Bill. That is no new principle. It has been already adopted by the South African Parliament... But in the Act of 1937 it was left to the Selection Board to decide whether or not a particular race or person is assimilable... When, therefore, it is known from the record of history, and from the frank admission of its members, that a certain race is not readily assimilable; when we know from our own observation that such a race has not been absorbed by either the English-speaking or by the Dutch-speaking section of the population, then the time has arrived that the board must receive instructions by legislation that such a race is not assimilable...

My contention is that the Jewish race, taken as a whole, is not readily absorbed by either the Dutch or English-speaking sections in South Africa. I know there are exceptions, there are exceptions to every rule, and so also there have been exceptions in the case of the Jewish race. But let us look at history. Since the Great Dispersion, for a period of over two thousand years, the Jew has wandered over the face of the earth, and to-day he is found in all countries of the globe; but throughout the ages, scattered as he is to-day over the face of the earth, he has always remained a Jew. You don't speak of a Jew in England as an Englishman, or in Holland as a Dutchman, or in France as a Frenchman. No, you speak of him as an English Jew, a Dutch Jew or a French Jew.

He has maintained his racial identity and his Jewish customs, he has remained true to the faith of his forefathers, he has maintained the purity of his Jewish blood, and above all he has remained a separate nation... The reason is apparent. Read through the Old Testament, the Laws of Moses. I could quote dozens of texts to show that the Jew received strict injunctions that he should not mix with the nations amongst whom he lived... For centuries at a time the Jews have lived in circumstances favourable to absorption. There were times when they were persecuted in certain countries and also in Great Britain, but there have also been long periods when they have lived under favourable circumstances in Great Britain and elsewhere, and yet they were not absorbed.

Even in America, the so-called melting-pot of the world, they have remained a separate nation. The Jew has a remarkable aptitude of being able to adapt himself to his environment, of being able to adopt the customs and the ways of living of the people amongst whom he lives, of being able to acquire the veneer of the people amongst whom he lives. That is where people make a mistake. They think that is absorption. It is nothing of the kind. It is merely the facility of the Jew to adapt himself to his environment. What is Zionism but the refusal of the Jew to assimilate, and that was the idea of Theodor Herzl, the founder of the movement.

Mr. Speaker, the Jew is a nomad by nature. I am not saying that in an unfavourable sense. I am not comparing the Jew with the gypsy; but the history of the Jew is a history of his wandering among the nations of the earth. The Jew is a cosmopolitan. The Jew looks forward to that time when there will be re-established a Jewish state where he will await the coming of the Messiah. But let the Jew speak for himself. I don't want to weary the House with quotations, but I think it is necessary to hear what leading Jews say. These books from which I shall quote are to be found in the parliamentary library.

Ludwig Lewisohn, a well-known Jewish writer, says—

Assimilation is impossible, because the Jew cannot change his national character.

He goes on further and says—

Assimilation is bankrupt. Germany was the great laboratory experiment, and I think that the experiment was necessary, but it failed.

Then there is another book, *The Real Jew*, written by H. Newman, with an introduction by Israel Zangwill. What does he say?—

In examining the causes which have served to keep the Jews "a people apart" we find that deeply engraved in the soul of the Jewish people there are certain fundamental ideals. . . These created an impassable barrier between their own deeply-rooted ideas of life and those of the surrounding peoples. Thus whereas the Flemings, the Normans and the

Huguenots were able wholly to assimilate with the English race at various epochs in their history, the Jews have never been able to merge themselves in their new environment to the same extent.

Then, sir, I find in A Book of Jewish Thoughts by Dr. J. H. Hertz, I think he was Chief Rabbi at one time, a chapter headed "The Tragedy of Assimilation." He says—

What I understand by assimilation is loss of identity. It is the kind of assimilation that I dread most, even more than pogroms.

Then from Jewish Life in Modern Times, by Israel Cohen—

However acute the divisions may be on the merits of orthodoxy, or on the virtue of the Zionist ideal, they are levelled by the influence of the past, which generates a spirit of solidarity welding the disparate units into a harmonious whole. Opposed to the agencies consciously striving for the conservation of Jewry are forces working for its dissolution. There is open advocacy of assimilation, viz., that Jews should regard themselves as distinguished from their fellow-citizens merely in respect of religion, but that otherwise they should merge themselves completely in the general life of a nation in whose midst they dwell. Thus the soul of Israel amongst the nations is nowhere immune from insidious assault.

Then I find that a distinguished Jew, Mr. Basil M. Henriques made a speech in London which was reported in the Zionist Record of South Africa of the 29th January last, and he says—

There must be no assimilation. We are a peculiar people, and a peculiar people we must remain.

I find also in the Zionist Record an article by Mr. Ludwig Lewisohn. He says—

Men exist in groups that create their cultures in their own image, and as the expression of their permanent character. Men exist in no other way. Neither do Jews. We are a culture-group; we are a people; we are a nationality. No, don't stick your head into the sand at this point. It's so silly, and so unrealistic, and so cowardly. We are a nationality.

And so, Mr. Speaker, when one examines the writings of Jewish writers, of those who have spoken on behalf of their race, one finds them fighting against this idea of assimilation. I repeat: the history of the Jews in those countries in which they have lived under favourable circumstances, show that they cannot be absorbed by other races. They may absorb others, but they themselves cannot be absorbed. It is also clear from their own admissions and statements that they do not wish to be absorbed.

In the second place it is necessary to discriminate against Jewish immigrants and the alien Jew in South Africa because, owing to certain racial characteristics and habits, the Jew creates a problem, as soon as his numbers unduly increase. What happens is that you have an alien body in the general body of the state, and, as in the human organism, such an alien body causes irritation and friction, and results in inflammation and disease. That is what has happened in many other countries, and that is what is happening in South Africa today.

What are those racial characteristics? In the first place the Jew is international. He is international in his outlook, and furthermore, he is part of a vast inter-locked organization. His race is spread over the globe, a race that is bound by ties of culture, religion and blood to which add the bonds of finance and commerce and industry. The Jew, in the first instance, is loyal to his own people, loyal to Israel, and what Israel stands for. In the second place he is concerned mainly with his own personal and material interests. May I refer to the position during the Great War in England? It explains this characteristic of the Jew. If one reads the post-war books it is perfectly clear that there was something wrong, especially during the earlier years of the war. Jewry believed that the central powers were going to win the war, and therefore the majority of Jews were backing the central powers. It was perfectly clear that things were going wrong in England, for instance with regard to supplies of foodstuffs, and that the blockade of Germany was ineffectual. It was later discovered that there was disloyalty on the part of some of the Jews in London and elsewhere.

It will be recollected that Sir Edgar Spear, a privy councillor, was later deprived of his naturalization certificate and of his honours, because it was proved that he was a member of the coterie of Jewish financiers who were working against the interests of England. Then the position became so acute that the British Government was obliged to do something in order to secure the support of the Jews. It was during the most critical period of the war. What did they do? It came in the form of the Balfour Declaration on Palestine. That declaration was not merely a happy idea on the part of Mr. Balfour. It was necessary for England to enlist Jewish help. The Jews were against England, but the Jew was prepared to give his help to the allied cause for a price, and the price that the British Government paid was the Balfour Declaration...

Again we have the matter of the boycott against German goods ...The hon. member for Cape Town (Castle) denied that the Jewish community had anything to do with the Jewish boycott in this country, and said that the Jews themselves merely decided not to buy German goods. He received support from the hon. member for Benoni (Mr. Madeley) who said that his party had been responsible for the boycott. If the hon. member for Benoni, or if the South African Trades and Labour Council wish to suggest that this German boycott originated with them, then in the language of the classics I say: "Go and tell that to the Marines." The idea originated with the Jews and with the Jewish Board of Deputies, and they used the South African Trades and Labour Council for the purpose of initiating this boycott. I have before me a circular which was sent to a Gentile firm calling upon them to boycott German goods and also warning them not to advertise in a German paper published in Johannesburg. The circular ends by saying—

Do you know that the Jewish community will see to it that your firm is boycotted if you continue to advertise in the Deutsch-Afrikaner of Pretoria?

I have also the envelope addressed to the firm in question. That was the way the boycott was carried on. It is still being carried on today. I have here a notice which is put on orders which are sent overseas, in the following form—

Acceptance of goods will be refused if the goods are shipped by a German vessel, or through a German port or insured with a German company.

Now, sir, when the Jew buys goods for his own personal use he is perfectly entitled to do that if he wishes, but in this case he is not buying goods for his own consumption, but goods which are sold to the Gentile population. I have the "Boycott Bulletin" which I read last year. The hon. member for Cape Town (Castle) said it was published in England. It was published in England, but it was distributed in South Africa. The boycott is a favourite weapon which is used by Jewry, and it is an efficient weapon from their point of view, because of the control they exercise on trade and industry. Allow me to say, and I say it with a full sense of responsibility, to the Jewish population of South Africa, that in making use of this boycott weapon in connection with trade, or in connection with Press advertisements, they are playing with fire, they are using a double-edged weapon. I say that the time will come when the people of South Africa will turn, and will not tolerate that sort of weapon being used in our country. I think that it is well that that word of warning should be sounded to the Jewish community in South Africa...

Another racial characteristic of the Jews which causes friction is the way in which the Jewish people seek to secure control of finance and business, the formation of monopolies, and also the domination of the professions. This is particularly so with regard to high finance and international banking. It is unnecessary to enter into that. I am sure that the members of the Jewish race themselves, will admit that they control high finance and international banking in Europe and in America. Remember that the international banker controls credit, and in that way through his control of credit, he is also able to exercise control over industry and trade. International finance and industry and trade are thus closely related. In the United States the Jews have already managed to secure control of a number of the most important industries in the country, finance, the wholesale and retail trade, the garment trade, motion pictures, furniture and liquor trade, and so on.

To a large extent the same thing has happened in England. But let us come to South Africa. One

has only to go about the country to see to what extent the Jew is controlling retail and wholesale business in South Africa. He controls the liquor trade. There is a body known as the South African Board of Distilleries, which is almost entirely controlled by Jews. There is amongst them a certain Mr Ashton, who figures as a director, but I find that his real name is Aronson. To a large extent the Jew controls the meat trade, and he almost entirely controls the theatre and cinema business. He exercises a large measure of control over the hotel trade and shirt manufacture. In the retail tobacco trade it is the same thing, and then one has only to look to the enormous economic control exercised by a prominent Jew, Mr. I. W. Schlesinger, to realise to what lengths this has gone. Not content with the control of finance and business, the Jew is now turning to the professions. I have gone through the telephone list very carefully in Johannesburg and Cape Town, and have taken only those names which I am quite sure are Jewish.

What do I find? That in Johannesburg 65 per cent of the attorney firms are Jewish; of the advocates 45 per cent are Jewish; in Cape Town the attorneys are 41 per cent, and the advocates 28 per cent. I have here the list of the law certificate examination results of January of this year. Forty-Four percent of the successful candidates in the Law Certificate examination were Jews...

As regards medical practitioners, in Johannesburg 48 percent are Jews, and that, I am informed, is a very conservative estimate, because I have not included the names of persons who have changed their names. In Cape Town at least 31 per cent of the medical practitioners are Jews. In the Witwaterstrand University Final Examination, 68 per cent of the successful medical students were Jews. In Cape Town the percentage was 32 per cent. I am informed that in the first, second and third year classes the percentage is even higher. But, sir, it is not only in business and the professions where the Jew occupies a position out of all proportion to his percentage of the population. We find him also in positions of authority. That is particularly so in England and America. That was particularly the case in England during the period of the Great War.

In the Lloyd George Cabinet there were several Jews. The Spectator, in an editorial in 1920, wrote —

We are convinced that at the present moment persons of the Jewish faith are far too numerous in our Cabinet. We have got a great many more Jews than we deserve.

The Spectator probably also had in mind the Marconi scandal which had taken place not long before, in which several prominent Jews were implicated. [Now] Jews often ask, "Why is the gentile unable to compete with the Jew? Is it not the fault of the gentile himself?" That charge has often been leveled. Let me frankly admit that the Jew is a very clever and adroit business man, but there are other reasons why the gentile finds it difficult to compete with him.

Firstly, as regards international trade and finance, there is the fact that the Jew is international, and has international affiliations. As regards inland trade, there is that racial cement, that bond of racial unity which enables the Jew to make arrangements which it is impossible for the gentile to make under similar circumstances. And finally, let me add this, namely, that in his business dealings with the gentile the Jew undoubtedly has a different outlook and a different business standard. I don't want to go too deeply into that aspect, as I do not wish to hurt the susceptibilities of members of this House who are Jews... I suggest to anybody who wishes to go into the matter further, to study the Talmud, and he will find some light thrown on the question as to why the Jew is able to compete so successfully with the gentile.

Another habit of the Jew which creates trouble and friction, especially when his numbers exceed a certain percentage, is the Jewish habit of secrecy. That aptitude of the Jew of being able to conceal what he wishes to keep secret, especially when it is in his own interests, was probably initiated during the period of persecutions, but it has remained a habit of the Jew, and has become almost a national instinct... This habit of concealment takes another form in the changing of names. Why does the Jew change his name? It is in order to give an outward appearance of having been assimilated. The hon. member for Troyeville (Mr Kentridge) admitted during the 1937 debate why he changed his name. Some remark was made about his having changed his name, and he said that he did it to show that he had been assimilated. But the hon. member remains the same Jew

that he was, whether he is called Kentridge or Kantorovitch. Another reason why the Jew changes his name is to secure certain advantages of a business or a social nature, and that is happening in South Africa.

I put a question to the hon.the Minister the other day. I took at random two cases which I happened to find in the Government Gazette where two Jews had changed their names. I asked what were "the good and sufficient reasons" postulated by the Act for the change of the name Cohen, and the Minister replied that this particular person had changed his name "for business, social and personal reasons." I submit that it was not the intention of the Act that a man should be permitted to change his name for such reasons. When a man changes his name for business reasons he is practising deception upon his customers and upon the people in the town where he does business; and I say to the Minister that he was not acting according to the spirit and according to the letter of the Act of 1937 when he allowed that man and others to change their names for business, social and personal reasons. That is not a good and sufficient reason under that Act.

Mr Speaker, I have shown that the Jew is unassimilable, and that he has certain racial characteristics. I have shown that when the Jewish population figure reaches a certain percentage of the population of a state, it causes trouble. That is also the view of the Jews themselves. The great leader of Jewish Zionism, Dr Herzl, is quoted in the South African Jewish Chronicle, of the 25th of May, 1934—

Herzl foresaw long ago that the percentage of Jews that a country can absorb before anti-Semitism sets in is very low, barely five per cent. After that a saturation sets in, the weather breaks, and threatening storms appear on the horizon.

Here in South Africa the Jewish population exceeds that percentage of safety. The saturation point was reached some time ago, and the storm clouds are not merely on the horizon, they have already moved up. I am not going to enter into discussion on figures, I am not going to ask whether in this year more Jews were allowed in than in another year, because that is beside the point, in view of the terms of my Bill, which says that no further Jewish immigration should be allowed in South Africa. But what I do say is that, having regard to the state of the problem, and the serious proportions it has attained in South Africa, we have to ask three questions: What is the Jewish population in South Africa; what percentage of the total white population does that constitute, and, finally, is it being fed by further immigration?

It is difficult to arrive at a definite figure as to what the South African Jewish population is to-day... In November, 1936, the Jewish Board estimated that the Jewish population was 95,000. Add to those figures, the immigration figures of the Selection Board, allow a percentage for those who do not attend the synagogue, and for "visitors" and "in transit" immigrants, allow also for the natural increase, because the Jews live according to the Mosaic laws, which tell them to be fruitful and to multiply... On this basis I think it can be safely said that on a conservative estimate the Jewish population must be to-day between 98,000 and 100,000, and that brings us to 5 per cent of the white population of South Africa.

South Africa has in actual numbers a larger Jewish population than fifteen European countries... Our attitude, sir, the attitude of the Nationalist Party, is that the Jewish population of South Africa is already too large. It has exceeded the danger point percentage. As far as I am concerned it is no good telling me that during this or that year immigration was so much less, or was only so much. Even if the number of immigrants were one hundred per annum, I say that they are one hundred too many, in view of the fact that saturation point has been reached, in the words of Dr. Herzl, the leader of the Zionist Movement.

We say that Jewish immigration must be completely stopped. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that that is the view, not only of those of us who sit on this side of the House, but I am convinced that that is the view which is shared by the great majority of the English and Dutch-speaking people in South Africa. I say that the time has arrived when we have to deal frankly with this problem. We owe it to our children, and it is only fair to the Jewish population themselves, to let them know where

they stand, to deal openly and frankly and honestly with them. This Bill of mine, contrary to the criticisms which have been made in the Press, does not touch the old-established Jew in South Africa. It is aimed to prevent any further Jewish immigration. It is further aimed at the alien Jew at present in South Africa.

May I commend, sir, to this House and also to hon. members who are Jews, and to Jews outside of this House, the words of a man who is a friend of the Jews, the words of Hilaire Belloc. He says —

There is a Jewish problem, and the Jews who resent the statement of the problem, and an attempt at solving it, are not doing their own people any good, and they are at the same time denying us the right to put our house in order, which denial is of course intolerable.

I say, sir, to the Government and to hon. members on that side of the House that if their Jewish supporters decline to see reason, then you owe it to the country to eliminate this factor from party political considerations. You owe it to the pioneers of the Great Trek, whose Centenary we recently celebrated, and you owe it to the pioneers of the 1820 settlers, these English and Dutch-speaking pioneers who left a heritage for their descendants in our country. I say further, you owe it to the people of South Africa, and you owe it to future generations of South Africans to tackle this problem now, before it is too late.

I say to the Jewish members of this House and to the Jewish community outside the House, "In your own interests, beware that you do not put anything in the way of the tackling of this problem. I say to you, read the history of your own race and people, and be satisfied with the numbers that you have in the country today."

When Mr. Louw had finished his speech, he was viciously attacked from many sides, both inside and outside the House of Deputies. Some members of his own Party did rise to defend him, but one deputy introduced some challenging remarks to the effect that Jews had had a hand in fomenting the Boer War. Another of Louw's backers quoted President Kruger, the hero of the Boers, as follows:

"If it were possible to throw the Jewish monopolists root and branch out of our country without causing a war with England, then the question of everlasting peace in South Africa would be solved."

The ironic thing was that the Jewish and leftist/bolshevik opposition to Louw was that the "humanitarianism" on behalf of Jews & their immigration came from those who benefitted both financially and politically from Apartheid, which legally made African Blacks second-class citizens.

After hearing the opposing arguments, Mr. Louw concluded:

“ Hon. members will realise that in connection with such an important matter, and seeing that attacks on the Bill have been made from all sides of the House, that I must have a reasonable opportunity to reply to such attacks and arguments. What particularly struck me in connection with the debate of the Bill is the great interest that was taken by the public during the debate, and also the space that was given to it in the Press of the country. It clearly appears from that that the public of South Africa feels strongly in regard to the Jewish question. By that interest it is admitted that we are dealing with a burning question, and let me tell hon. members, especially those on the other side of the House, that this feeling is not restricted to one section of the population.

Since the Bill was published, and since the debate here took place, I have had numbers and numbers of letters and telegrams from all parts of the country, and eight out of every ten of the letters and telegrams came from English-speaking people. As we are concerned with such an important matter which affects the future of our children in South Africa, it is tragic that the attitude of the Government should be influenced and settled by the question of political advantage of Jewish assistance at elections. That is the motive which guides the attitude of hon. members opposite, that is what influences them... On the public platforms, and in the House of

Assembly the impression is created as if the object was to start a persecution of the old-established Jewish population. Anyone who reads the Bill will see that that is not so.

The main principle of the Bill is to put a stop to further Jewish immigration, and in the second place it embraces the principle that Jews who are still aliens, who have not yet become naturalised, and who entered the country since 1930, shall be treated in a particular way. But yet we find that the Minister, the man who we would have expected to make a study of the Bill, talks here of Jewish persecution...One of the other characteristics of the debate on previous occasions, and also to-day, is the fact that those who have taken part in it did not go into the merits of the matter, but they confined themselves to generalities. They did not deal with the question of the position of the Jews in South Africa, and debate this question on its merits, nor the role that is being played by the Jew, or the danger which the question will be in the future to us as well as to the Jews themselves. Those questions have not been gone into.

So also we find, for instance, that the Minister of the Interior said not a word about the question of assimilation, which surely is the basic principle of this Bill. He simply makes the statement, namely, that I would be surprised to see how many marriages were taking place between Jews and Christians ...For the rest, with regard to the speech of the Minister of the Interior, it was a repetition of the old stories of intolerance, of democracy, of discrimination and the like...It is no use coming to this House and mentioning the names of fifteen or twenty Jews in South Africa who have become more or less assimilated, and to forget the enormous number of 99,990 who have not. It is no argument to prove that the Jew, as such, is assimilable...A difference is drawn by them between the Jewish men who came in and the women and children who came in later. I must admit that I cannot see the validity of such an argument. If the family comes in with the husband, then they are counted together as Jews who have come into the country. What difference does it make then if the father comes in advance to spy out the land, and his wife and children follow two, three or five months later? They are just as much Jewish immigrants as he is! I really cannot see the force of that argument; it simply will not hold water.

Then he and other hon. members also used the argument of the great value the Jews were to the country, how the Jews had the initiative in connection with the establishment of industries, provided work for our people, and also raised the standard of living in the country. There again you have an argument which I personally, and others also, cannot follow — we can not agree to the argument that those industries would not have been established if it were not for the Jews. Take the shirt factories. This industry was started by Christians and to-day as far as I know, only one [factory] has continued to remain in Christian hands. The others are all in Jewish hands, or had to make way for Jewish undertakings. To tell us that we should allow still more Jews into the country because the Jew has initiative is no argument. The Englishman, e.g. has just as much initiative so far as industries are concerned, as any other race in the world. If the Jew had not established those industries, then the Englishman would have done so, but at the moment they have to take a back place to the Jews.

And is it correct that the standard of living is being increased by the Jews owing to their participation in industry? Take a report which we had a few days ago in the newspapers with regard to a certain Jewish woman who was up before the court, and she was convicted and heavily fined because she compelled girls to pay back a part of their wages. I am told by persons who are engaged in our industries, that such practices are a great evil in the industries, and a large section of the people who are guilty of those evils are precisely these Jews who have come into the country during the past years...

But then I want to point out to the hon. member that the Jewish question is not a question of religion, but a question of race. Marx was therefore a Jew, whether he was converted or not. And then it is also said that the Jews have not played an important role in Communism. If the hon. member for Bloemfontein (City) said that Karl Marx was not the spiritual father of Communism, then I can only say he apparently does not know what he is speaking about, and I would advise him to make a study of Communism...According to the statements of experts about what took place in Russia, it has been incontrovertibly proved that a large section of the communist

committees consisted of Jews. According to one authority there were in 1935, 56 out of the 59 members of the Central Comintern, and I have already mentioned what I saw myself in regard to the Jews as Soviet ambassadors, and as representatives of Russia at the League of Nations.

Even in Germany Jews were the promoters of Communism. I need only mention the names of Clara Zetkin, Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht, Kurt Eisner, and Levi, and the same was the case in Hungary, where Bela Kun, formerly Cohen, was, the leader of the communist revolution. He was also a Jew, and the Minister of Justice can testify that that was the bloodiest revolution which took place there. He knows about it, because he was sent there by the Allied Powers to try and settle things. In Spain you had the same thing. There the communists were organised by Rosenberg, who went there as the ambassador of Russia, but in reality he had another object. And we find the same thing in South Africa as well. Here the leaders of the communists are Harry Snitcher, one Weinstein, one Kahn and one Cohen, and all are Jews. We have therefore to deal with facts which cannot be denied.

But then it is asked why on the one hand it is said that the Jews are communists and on the other hand that the Jews are capitalists? I know it appears to be a paradox, but one of the chief objects of communism is the control of the production and of the distribution. By that the communists mean the control of distribution and of production by officials, and the officials, in turn, are usually Jews, who are also looking after their own pockets... But let us stick to historical facts, and then we find that as soon as the percentage of Jews in a country becomes too large you have had Jewish persecutions. I am accused of all kinds of offences, anti-Semitism and even worse, but I say in all seriousness, that I, as a South African, am concerned about the growing Jewish population in South Africa, and if we do not take steps we shall have the same development in South Africa that there has already been in other countries.

I want to say to my hon. friends there that they are making a mistake in thinking that there is not a strong and constantly growing anti-Semitic feeling in the country. It has become plain to me from the large number of letters which I have received from the Union and from Rhodesia as well. I say in all seriousness, as a South African, that if the Government shows that it really wants to put an end to the Jewish immigration into South Africa, and wants to take action against the alien Jew, it will then contribute in great measure to the reduction of the anti-Jewish feeling which we have in the country. But as long as the Government does not take action, that feeling will increase and become worse, and the day will come when there will be an outburst, and the Government and hon. members on that side will have to take responsibility for that.

And then, finally, there is the most important section in connection with the attacks on my Bill. It is the Jewish members in this House ... But what struck me...was that they did not say a single word about the main principle of my Bill, namely assimilation. They absolutely neglected it, because they know that the statements which I made were not incorrect. They know that the Jews cannot or will not assimilate, that the Jews consider themselves a separate nation, and that they want to remain a separate nation. The chief characteristic of the speech of the hon. member for Troyeville was not what he said, but what he did not say. He says that the immigration is a small trickle, and he brings up the same old argument of the women and the children and the aged people... Then he says that the refugee question is an international matter. It may be that it has international repercussions, but the question with which we have to deal to-day is an economic matter, which affects every man, woman and child in our country. Therefore it is no good to get rid of the point by saying that we are dealing with an international question.

Then he says further that I quoted wrongly from certain Jewish writings, and in connection with that I will just confine myself to one example. It is the case of my quotations from the book by Israel Cohen about the solidarity of Jewry. In that book there is a chapter with the title of "Solidarity." The hon. member for Troyeville wants to make out that I did not quote everything, and that the solidarity of the Jews is only aimed at questions of charity, schools, etc. Of course, I did not want to detain the House by quoting two or three pages, but what actually occurred is that the hon. member for Troyeville only mentioned one or two of the characteristics of that solidarity. But the hon. member is very careful to quote everything which, according to him, I left

out, because it says that the solidarity is not only confined to matters of religion, but that it must also stand on a solid foundation in regard to political and social questions. Then the writer goes on and mentions the organisations which exist in different countries to promote immigration. What I left out does not weaken my position, but on the contrary, it strengthens my argument...

The hon. member for Troyeville went further and questioned my figures in regard to the percentage of Jewish doctors and attorneys. He asks why I went through the telephone book, and not the directory, or some other register. Surely the telephone book was the best for the purpose, and if the hon. member examines it, he will find that my percentages were not too high, but on the contrary were very conservative. I have a list here in regard to Johannesburg alone of the number of doctors there. Jewish doctors, who have changed their names, and one has even adopted a name with a hyphen to make it sound more truly English. My figures are not only correct, but very conservative. He asks why I only produced the figures for Johannesburg and Cape Town. Surely that is where we have the greatest concentration of the population. But even so far as the whole country is concerned, the percentage of the Jewish doctors is 26 per cent, and the hon. member forgets that in the universities 50 per cent to 70 per cent of the medical students are Jewish, so that in future the percentage of Jewish doctors will rise still more.

Then the hon. member says that the public service is closed to the Jews. I don't know how he arrives at that. It is indeed true that few Jews sit for the examination for admission to the public service, but that is because the monetary advantages from the public service are not sufficiently attractive for them. Of course, you do not find them in the ordinary banks behind the counter as tellers, the Jews like to deal with money but not to count it for other people. But although you do not see the Jew behind the counter in the ordinary commercial banks, you find him in control of the big financial houses in America and Europe, of the so-called acceptance houses in Europe, and of the big private banks. I can mention a dozen names of large financial institutions in Europe which are in Jewish hands. The Jewish financiers do actually control what is called "big finance"...

[Israel Cohen] says that such assimilation is a danger to the soul of the people of Israel. He complains of the fact that the Jews will lose their identity as a separate people — just as for instance the hon. member for Johannesburg (North) has lost the German identity of his ancestors. That is what is meant by assimilation, your absorption by the people amongst whom the immigrant goes to live. We have the example of the Huguenots and the Germans, who identified themselves with the population of South Africa and were absorbed by the English-speaking and the Afrikaans-speaking people, and became "one" with them.

The hon. member for Umlazi, says that anti-Semitism is "manufactured" in Germany. May I give the Jewish members the advice to read a book which recently appeared by a well-known journalist, Sisley Huddleston, in which he tells of a conversation which he had with prominent Jews in Geneva, and that the most important of them said [re-translation]—

[indent] *What I hope is that Hitler will start a persecution of Jews, because we need it to bring us together again as one people.* [indent]

That was a statement by a well-known and prominent Jew. He interpreted what was undoubtedly in the minds of Jews, namely the maintenance of their identity as a separate people. Now I come to the hon. member for Cape Town (Castle). He quoted what I am supposed to have said about Zionism. It is not for me to criticise Zionism, it is a matter for the Jews. If they think that the Jewish people will find their salvation in the new Palestine, in the new Jerusalem then it is their business. It is not for me or other Christians to criticise it. But what I did say and still say is that the Zionist movement testifies to the fact that the Jews do not want to assimilate, that they want to remain a separate people. Otherwise you could not have such a movement. That is all the hon. member said about assimilation.

You will always find that on this question the basic principle of my Bill will be very hesitatingly referred to by the Jews and others. They are very much afraid of that point... I must express my regret at having detained the House so long, but in the circumstances it was necessary to deal with the matter that has been raised here. I would like to make an appeal to hon. members

opposite at any rate to show in connection with this matter at least that they have the courage of their convictions. It is no use saying as has been said by members of the Government that they are not divided on the matter. We know that they are. We can mention names to prove it but I will not do so...Here we have a Bill which provides a means of settling the Jewish question in South Africa. It is no use for hon. members to go to the country or to their constituencies, and to say that they also are in favour of stopping Jewish immigration, but that they voted against the Bill, because there was something here or there that they could not support. They know quite well that they can agree to the principle of the Bill, and that they could then bring up any amendments about which they could convince the House in the committee stage. They will admit that the main principle of it is the stopping of further Jewish immigration into South Africa.

I hope that hon. members will understand this quite well, and I hope that there are some in their party who will have the courage of their convictions and will show that they agree with us in regard to the great matter, a matter which not only affects us to-day but which is becoming worse from day to day and which will affect future generations, their children and children's children...We...have brought forward a clear policy and if the Government party rejects this measure, the responsibility will rest on the shoulders of the Government and the Government party, for what may occur now or in the future.

In the end, Louw's bill was democratically refused by a vote of 81 to 17. The 81 "No" votes were registered by all of the English-speakers and Jews and a few Afrikaners. The "Yes" votes came entirely from Afrikaners.

And this is a recurring theme for the immigration policies of White countries of this period. Decades after Mr. Louw's attempt to protect the White heritage of South Africa, other White countries began flooding their countries with millions of non-Whites. Mr. Louw spoke for all Whites and believed, just like most White gentile Americans at the time, that his country had a right to prevent a flood of Jewish immigration. On a positive note, Jews were unable to turn Mr. Louw into a pariah among his fellow Afrikaners. Though a minority voted against him, most stuck by him and as their influence rose in South African, Louw was given multiple high level diplomatic and cabinet posts, including the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Eric Louw died on June 24, 1968, decades before the end of Apartheid (1990s).

Last edited by Lamprecht on Wed Apr 22, 2020 8:51 am, edited 3 times in total.

"There is a principle which is a bar against all information, which is proof against all arguments, and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance -- that principle is contempt prior to investigation."

— Herbert Spencer



Lamprecht
Valuable asset



Pre-1939 South Africa's Madagascar Plan poster blaming Jews for pushing Communism

📅 1 year 4 months ago (Wed Apr 22, 2020 8:29 am)

From the USHMM, simply dated "Before 1939"

“ Antisemitic publication issued in Pietermaritzburg, South Africa claiming that Jews are responsible for communism and should go to Madagascar.

Photograph | Photograph Number: 63662



(image mirror [↗](#))

Antisemitic publication issued in Pietermaritzburg, South Africa claiming that Jews are responsible for communism and should go to Madagascar.

The publication was printed by Ray Rudman, Pietermaritzburg, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. It was found by Tine Thevenin inside a bible purchased in Norway and donated to the USHMM in 2000.

<https://collections.ushmm.org/search/catalog/pa1154151> [↗](#) or <http://archive.fo/E8c9d> [↗](#) or [http://web.archive.org/web/202004221315 ... /pa1154151](http://web.archive.org/web/202004221315.../pa1154151) [↗](#)

"There is a principle which is a bar against all information, which is proof against all arguments, and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance -- that principle is contempt prior to investigation."

— Herbert Spencer

Mortimer

Valued contributor

CONTRIBUTOR

Re: South African opposition to Jewish immigrants in the 1930s // South African communism pushed by Jews

2 weeks 6 days ago (Tue Aug 31, 2021 10:26 pm)

The fears and concerns of South Africans towards Jewish emigration were well founded. And they proved correct. Joe Slovo and other Jews were allies of Nelson Mandela and the ANC.

[http://www.unz.com/article/blacks-books ... o-america/](http://www.unz.com/article/blacks-books...o-america/) [↗](#)

There are 2 sides to every story - always listen or read both points of view and make up your own mind. Don't let others do your thinking for you.



Tiepolo

Re: South African opposition to Jewish immigrants in the 1930s // South African communism pushed by Jews

📅 1 day 21 hours ago (Sun Sep 19, 2021 11:56 pm)

Even before the anti-apartheid terrorist attacks of the 1980's, people in the 1930's remembered the Rand Rebellion. Like Americans, South Africans had a good reason to be concerned about Jewish communists trying to cause chaos in their country. Jews in South Africa today don't even live among the blacks they "emancipated", they live in Jewish-only suburbs that are protected by private security.



Display posts from previous: All posts ▼

Sort by Post time ▼

Ascending ▼

Go

Post Reply



4 posts • Page 1 of 1

◊ [Return to "WWII Europe / Atlantic Theater Revisionist Forum"](#)

Jump to ▼

Who is online

Users browsing this forum: No registered users and 1 guest

about us

The CODOH Revisionist Forum is the world's largest and liveliest revisionist-moderated on-line discussion of the Holocaust.

join us



[🏠 Board index](#)

[✉ Contact us](#)



[The team](#)



[Delete all board cookies](#)

All times are [UTC-05:00](#)

It is currently Tue Sep 21, 2021 9:12 pm

Designed by PG and devNET software group. Powered by nginx and MariaDB. Built with phpBB.